



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,526	12/13/2001	R. Dennis Nesbitt	P-5512	4775

24492 7590 07/31/2003

THE TOP-FLITE GOLF COMPANY
425 MEADOW STREET
PO BOX 901
CHICOPEE, MA 01021-0901

EXAMINER

GORDON, RAEANN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3711

DATE MAILED: 07/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

10/015,526

Applicant(s)

NESBITT, R. DENNIS

Examiner

Raeann Gorden

Art Unit

3711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 3-5-02 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3-5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the markings on the cover indicating the high-density regions (claim 6) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 5 and 10 recite the limitation "the cover" in lines 1 and 4, respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5 and 7-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sullivan et al (5,984,806). Regarding claim 1, Sullivan discloses a golf ball comprising a core, an inner cover layer and an outer cover layer. The inner cover layer is equivalent to applicant's outer core layer. The inner cover layer includes a high-density region (figs 3 and 3B). As shown in the figures the high-density regions are located at the center of the golf ball, which is equivalent to applicant's location centered about the horizontal spin axis. Compare apps figure 3 and Sullivan's figure 3. Regarding claim 2, the high-density regions comprise a continuous or discontinuous band of high-density regions (see figures 4 and 8). Regarding claim 3, the band or high-density regions are disposed in the inner cover (apps outer core layer). Regarding claims 4 and 7-9, Sullivan discloses a band comprising two or more equally segmented parts as shown in the section of the golf ball in applicant's figure 10. Figure 8 of Sullivan displays a golf ball with two high-density bands that intersect in two locations. A section view of the golf ball would create a band comprising four equally segmented high-density regions identical to applicant's figure 10. Regarding claim 5, the weighting material is visible along the ball exterior (col. 7, lines 50-52). Regarding claim 10, figure 9 of Sullivan discloses 4 high-density bands, which in section view is equivalent to a high-density

Art Unit: 3711

band comprising 8 equally spaced high-density regions. The golf ball includes an outer cover layer (fig 1). Regarding claim 11, Sullivan discloses a golf ball comprising a core, an inner cover layer and an outer cover layer. The inner cover layer is equivalent to applicant's outer core layer. The inner cover layer includes a high-density region extending around the longitudinal axis of the core perpendicular to the ball's spin axis. (figs 8). Regarding claims 12 and 13, the filler may be any type with a high specific gravity, such as tungsten, which has a specific gravity of 19.35 (see col. 25). Regarding claim 14, the high-density regions comprise a continuous or discontinuous band of high-density regions (4 and 8). Regarding claim 15, Sullivan discloses a band comprising two or more equally segmented parts as shown in the section of the golf ball in applicant's figure 10. Figure 8 of Sullivan displays a golf ball with two high-density bands that intersect in two locations. A section view of the golf ball would create a band comprising four equally segmented high-density regions identical to applicant's figure 10. Regarding claim 16, Sullivan discloses a golf ball comprising a core, an inner cover layer and an outer cover layer. The inner cover layer is equivalent to applicant's outer core layer. Regarding claims 17 and 18, the high-density band is continuous metal band (fig 8). Col. 25 discloses metals such as aluminum (sp. 2.7) and nickel (sp. 8.9) used in the high-density region. Regarding claim 19, Sullivan discloses a golf ball comprising a core, an inner cover layer and an outer cover layer. The inner cover layer is equivalent to applicant's outer core layer. The inner cover layer includes a high-density region (figs 3 and 3B). As shown in the figures the high-density regions are located at the center of the golf ball, which is equivalent to applicant's location centered

Art Unit: 3711

about the spin axis. Compare apps figure 3 and Sullivan's figure 3. Regarding claim 20, the golf ball includes an outer cover layer.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 11-13, 16, 18, and 19 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 9 and 16 of U.S. Patent No. 6,261,193. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the '193 patent anticipates the present invention.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 6 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raeann Gorden whose telephone number is 703-308-8354. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Sewell can be reached on 703-308-2126. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9302 for regular communications and 703-872-9303 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.


Raeann Gorden
Examiner
Art Unit 3711

rg
July 26, 2003